

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, Examiner indicated that Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on 1/22/2002 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and the Examiner has considered it. The Examiner objected to the abstract and required a corrected abstract. The Examiner also objected to the disclosure because direct Internet links are not allowed and should be removed and required a corrected disclosure. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Handler.

In this Reply, Applicants have submitted an amended paragraph [0003] and Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 5, 11, and 17. Applicants believe this application is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to the specification on the basis that the abstract is a copy of the claim 1 and part of the summary. For these reasons, the Examiner required a corrected abstract.

Applicants submit that the current abstract complies with the MPEP and, therefore, this objection to the specification should be withdrawn. MPEP 608.01(b) provides the guidelines for the abstract of the specification, stating in relevant part:

(b) A brief abstract of the technical disclosure in the specification must commence on a separate sheet, preferably following the claims, under the heading "Abstract" or "Abstract of the Disclosure." The sheet or sheets presenting the abstract may not include other parts of the application or other material. The abstract in an application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111 may not exceed 150 words in length. The purpose of the abstract is to enable the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the public generally to determine quickly from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains.

If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure.

If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement.

In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or a use thereof.

If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

The Abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure and includes that which Applicants submit is new in the art to which the invention pertains. For example, the Abstract states: “[T]here is provided a method and apparatus for receiving a streamed zip file and accessing contents of the zip file’s central directory . . . A zip interface is provided to access the contents of the zip file’s central directory as the central directory is received by the zip receiver.” The Abstract does not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and does not compare the invention with the prior art. Accordingly, the Abstract conforms to the guidelines of MPEP 608.01(b).

The Examiner also objected to the specification because of alleged informalities on page 3, line 5 and required appropriate correction. In response, Applicants submit an amended paragraph [003]. Applicants respectfully submit that amended paragraph

[003] corrects informalities alleged by the Examiner because “<http://www.pkware.com/support/appnote.html>” is not underlined in amended paragraph [003] and, therefore, amended paragraph [003] does not include any direct Internet links. Amended paragraph [003] does not add new matter.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-19**

The Examiner also alleges that claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hundler. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Hundler discloses a method and apparatus for streaming the contents of an extracted Java Archive (JAR) file from a server device to a client device. Hundler’s title is misleading because Hundler does not disclose streaming a JAR file. Instead, the server device first extracts the JAR file as a set of streamable modules and then sends the modules to the client device. (p. 2 ¶ 0009, p. 8 ¶ 0073-0074). The client device, or receiving device, can receive and store the streamed modules, and can reconstruct the JAR file. (p. 8 ¶ 0075-0076)

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, receiving a stream of data containing an un-extracted zip file. Hundler provides no teaching of streaming or receiving an un-extracted zip file. Instead, Hundler teaches a server device that extracts the JAR file and streams *extracted* modules to the client device. The client device can then reconstruct and store the JAR file. Receiving extracted modules is not the same as, for example, “receiving a stream of data containing an un-extracted zip file,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Hundler fails to teach at least this element of claim 1, and therefore the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least due to their dependency from allowable claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Amended claims 5, 11, and 17, although of different scope, includes recitations that are similar to allowable claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons given with respect to claim 1, claims 5, 11, and 17 are also allowable. Claims 6-10 depend from claim 5 and are allowable at least due to their dependency from allowable claim 5, as well as their additional recitations; claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and are allowable at least due to their dependency from allowable claim 11, as well as its additional recitations, and claims 18-19 depend from claim 17 and are allowable at least due to their dependency from allowable claim 17, as well as their additional recitations. Accordingly, for at least the reasons given above, claims 2-19 are not anticipated by Handler, and the rejection of claims 2-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 2, 2004

By:   
Kevin M. Rosenbaum  
Reg. No. 47,907